

03-07-07 *JSW* 3624



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

: Examiner:

JOHN W. HARGRAVE ET AL.

: THU THAO HAVEN

Serial No. 10/029,589

: Group Art Unit: 3624

Filing Date: December 21, 2001

: Attorney Docket No.: CMS-101A

For: BANKRUPTCY CREDITOR MANAGER :
INTERNET SYSTEM

Director of Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATION OF EXPRESS MAIL

The undersigned hereby certifies that this document was delivered to the United States Post Office in Flemington, New Jersey 08822 between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 6, 2007. The undersigned further declares that this Certification is made with the knowledge that willful false statements are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under application sections of United States law, and that willful false statements made before the United States Patent and Trademark Office may jeopardize the validity of the application or issuing patent related thereto.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kenneth P. Glynn".

Kenneth P. Glynn

EM RRR EB 181517736 US
(CMS-101A)



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

:Examiner:

JOHN W HARGRAVE ET AL

: THU THAO HAVAN

Serial No. 10/029,589

: Group Art Unit: 3624

Filing Date: December 21, 2001

: Attorney Docket No.: CMS-101A

For: BANKRUPTCY CREDITOR MANAGER :
INTERNET SYSTEM

Honorable Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REQUEST FOR RESPONSE

This is in response to the Final Rejection in the above matter. An Amendment and Response was filed to the Patent Office (Amendment and Response after Final Rejection) August 9, 2006. An Advisory Action was sent on September 7, 2006, to the undersigned indicating that the Amendment and Response after Final Rejection dated August 9, 2006, failed to place the case in condition for allowance. In response, the undersigned phoned Examiner Havan to discuss the Advisory Action. The undersigned and Examiner Havan discussed the problem that the Advisory Action indicated that the claims in the proposed amendments filed after Final Rejection would not be entered because they raised new issues. Specifically, proposed claims 41 through 56 would not be entered for purposes of appeal. The undersigned indicated that new claims 41 through 56 were exactly what Examiner Havan had requested in my conversation with her in July, 2006.